



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/034,237

12/27/2001

Jyrki Hoisko

006474.00004

9105

22907 7590 08/19/2008

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

1100 13th STREET, N.W.

SUITE 1200

WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051

EXAMINER

AMINI, JAVID A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2628

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/19/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-25, 29-48 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim 26-28 are cancelled, Applicant requires clearing the number of new claims 49-83 (wrote 49-82) added, see remarks on page 14.

In response to Applicant's argument that DIG does not teach what is in fig. 2-5 is a screenshot, and does not teach the left hand portion of fig. 2-5 will ever displayed. Contrary, DIG displayed the left hand portion of fig. 2-5 in fig. 3-3, see display area.

In response to applicant's argument that the Office Action conceded that DIG does not teach predetermined side-by-side arrangement, Examiner refers Applicant to see the specification objection, Examiner interpreted the language of "predetermined sequence" as predetermined side-by-side arrangement, because the specification does not provide a clear explanation for the feature of "predetermined sequence". Unfortunately Applicant amended the claim feature to read as ""predetermined time sequence", and still neither the specification nor the Applicant do not explicitly clear this feature for expediting the prosecution.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities in claims 1, 41, 42, 45-46 recited a inconsistent terminology of "a predetermined time sequence" the *Examiner interprets it as a delay time between an image with its metadata or a visual effect or visual information, another words the image displays first then according to a user's rights its metadata or a visual effect or visual information will be displayed,*

Suggestion: Applicant may provide or refer to specification for more explanation to clear this ambiguous limitation. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-11, 21-23, 33-35, 42-44, 46-58, 67-69, 76-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DIG35 Specification Metada for digital Images version 1.0, by Digital Imaging Group, Inc, hereinafter DIG, in view of Morris US 6871231 B2, (cited in 892 dated 2/15/2008) hereinafter Morris.

Claim 1.

DIG teaches a method (e.g., see fig. 2-1) comprising: teaches receiving both image data and additional visual effect information (e.g., in fig. 3-3 creator can be considered as one user and metadata editor can be considered as second user), Examiner's note: the claimed invention does not explicitly specify the geographical position of the two users, because the users may be located remotely and communicating via internet or locally between two different systems, DIG teaches in fig. 2-5 generating a visual effect to be presented in association with a version of the image said visual effect being generated based on said visual effect information (e.g., section 2.3.3 second bullet),

DIG does not explicitly specify (see underlined features) after said receiving and generating displaying at said user equipment a version of said image with the visual effect on a display of the user equipment and (DIG teaches the image without said visual effect on the

Art Unit: 2628

display, on page 11 section 3.3.2 discloses that the applications read and parse the XML data, also the application may update or delete existing metadata (Examiner's note: visual effect or image information) the image without said visual effect on the display **in a predetermined time sequence**.

The second reference Morris has been reviewed DIG (first reference) in col. 1 lines 22-60, and discloses that there is at the time of his invention no control over what each user views (an image with metadata information). Morris's invention is an improved method for providing users access to digital image metadata.

Therefore Morris teaches after said receiving and generating displaying at said user equipment a version of said image with the visual effect on a display of the user equipment and the image without said visual effect on the display **in a predetermined time sequence**.

*Examiner interprets the following feature of **in a predetermined time sequence** that applicant added to claimed invention, as a delay time between an image with its metadata or a visual effect or visual information, another words the image displays first then according to a user's rights its metadata or a visual effect or visual information will be displayed.* Morris teaches in bridging paragraph of cols. 3 and 4.

Thus, it would have been obvious to an ordinary person skill in the art to modify the teachings of Morris i.e. the user's role into DIG's teachings in order to provide the use of metadata with digital imaging with the advantage of being able to access a wide variety of data regarding the image. When a user accesses the image, however, the user is typically shown all the metadata associated with that image.

Claim 2.

Art Unit: 2628

DIG teaches the image without said visual effect on the display, on page 11 section 3.3.2 discloses that the applications read and parse the XML data, also the application may update or delete existing metadata (Examiner's note: visual effect or image information). Morris teaches in bridging paragraph of cols. 3 and 4.

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person skill in the art to modify the teachings of Morris i.e. the user's role into DIG's teachings in order to provide the use of metadata with digital imaging with the advantage of being able to access a wide variety of data regarding the image. When a user accesses the image, however, the user is typically shown all the metadata associated with that image.

Regarding claim 49, it is rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claim 2, above.

Claim 3.

DIG teaches in fig. 3-3 search using a metadata, that means the visual effect or information data is started before all image data has been received.

Regarding claim 50, it is rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claim 3, above.

Claim 4.

DIG on page 11 discloses periodically the application updates the image's metadata.

Regarding claim 51, it is rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claim 4, above.

Claim 5.

DIG teaches on page 4 section 2.2 that the visual effect is associated with the image.

Regarding claim 52, it is rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claim 5, above.

Claim 6.

Art Unit: 2628

DIG teaches on page 4 section 2.2 that the visual effect is associated with the image as the title, date/time of the capture, the capture source, and etc.

Regarding claim 53, it is rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claim 6, above.

Claim 7.

Regarding the rejection of claim 7 is rejected with similar reason as set forth in claim 1 above. Except the visual effect visualizes the age of the image, see fig. 2-1 illustrates the picture of Maui with dated 1999/12/09 that is obvious to an ordinary person skill in the art to recognize it as an age of the image/picture.

Regarding claim 54, it is rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claim 7, above.

Claims 8-10.

DIG teaches on page 9 the visual effect visualizes a location of the source of the image data, section 3.2.3.

Regarding claims 55-57, they are rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claims 8-10, above.

Claim 11.

DIG teaches the visual effect visualizes relative location between the device and the user equipment, see section B.3.2.5 on page 36 subject distance.

Regarding claim 58, it is rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claim 11, above.

Regarding claims 21-22, and 24 DIG discloses on page 3 the importance of metadata in an image, that may cause to prioritize order of the image.

Regarding claims 67-68, they are rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claims 21-22, above.

Claim 23.

DIG teaches on page 44 fig. C-1.

Regarding claim 69, it is rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claim 23, above.

Claims 33-34, 76-77.

DIG teaches under section 2.1.

Claims 35, 78.

DIG teaches under section 2.4.

Claim 42.

Claim 42 is rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claim 1 above.

Claim 43.

DIG teaches the claimed feature in section 2.4 page 7.

Claim 44.

The claimed feature which is configured to display said visual effect before all image data has been received, DIG teaches in section 2.4 page 7, different approaches to load the image data before or after the metadata, this option can be customized by a user.

Claims 46-48.

Claim 46 is rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claim 1 above. Regarding claim 47 recited the predetermined sequence is determined by the additional associated information, That DIG in fig. 2-5 illustrates four pages of image metadata in a predetermined time sequence, see specification objection for more detailed information.

Regarding claim 48, Examiner believes that conveying a message can be referred to fig. 2-5 of DIG that the image is an old image because the visual effect of folding top corner of the image.

Claims 12-20, 24-25, 29-32, 36-41, 45, 59-66, 70-75, 79-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DIG, Morris, and in view of Delorme et al. 6,321,158 B1, hereinafter Delorme.

Claim 12.

DIG teaches on page 46 section C.3.4 location, GPS coordinate, for location of an object see section F.2.15 location type, but DIG and Morris do not illustrate first and second locations as Delorme illustrates in figs. 1A2-3 a navigation system with a wireless device. The function of a navigation system is well known.

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Delorme's PDA 15 in fig. 1A3, also using the internet 109 in fig. 1A into DIG and Morris, because, Delorme uses the navigation, and a digital camera 13 with a wireless system that would be beneficial to a user to incorporate DIG's XML (Extensible Markup Language) to obtain the claimed limitations.

Regarding claim 59, it is rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claim 12, above.

Claim 13.

DIG teaches on page 46 section C.3.4 location, GPS coordinate, and for location of an object see section F.2.15 location type.

Regarding claim 60, it is rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claim 13, above.

Claim 14.

DIG teaches under section B.3.2 camera capture.

Art Unit: 2628

Claim 15.

Dig in fig. 2-1 illustrates an image of Maui Hawaii.

Regarding claim 61, it is rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claim 15, above.

Claim 16.

DIG under section C.3.4 location teaches address, GPS coordinate, DIG does not explicitly specify displaying a map but it would have been obvious to an ordinary person in the art to recognize that the GPS coordinate can be considered as a map.

Regarding claim 62, it is rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claim 16, above.

Claim 17.

DIG teaches on page 92 the GPS reference points as North/South, East/West, sse page 94 section F.2.16 under “Yaw”.

Regarding claim 63, it is rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claim 17, above.

Claim 18.

DIG teaches on page 36 under subject distance.

Regarding claim 64, it is rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claim 18, above.

Claim 19.

Recited the size of the image is changed at a speed that visualizes the distance between the location and the user equipment. Examiner’s interpretation: the automatic zooming that Delorme teaches in the abstract teaches the claimed feature, because an ordinary person in the art would be able to change the size of the image by altering the zooming in/out.

Art Unit: 2628

Regarding claim 65, it is rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claim 19, above.

Claim 20

DIG does not explicitly specify moving a version of the image on the display; however, it would have been obvious to an ordinary person in the art to recognize that DIG covers the claimed feature under B.3.4.2 Film.

Regarding claim 66, it is rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claim 20, above.

Claims 24-25.

Delorme teaches moving arrow 32 in fig. 1A2 that can be considered as a visual effect of the origin of the image, DIG teaches under II.2.2.4. on page 152. DIG teaches under section 2.1.

Regarding claims 70-71, they are rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claims 24-25, above.

Claim 29.

DIG teaches in section 2.2. Delorme in col. 28 lines 11-13 teaches colored symbols.

Regarding claim 72, it is rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claim 29, above.

Claim 30.

DIG teaches on page 36 using color temperature may visualize a predefined condition.

Regarding claim 73, it is rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claim 30, above.

Claims 31-32, the following limitations are obvious because any computer equipped with a graphical controller that manage the colors on a display, the claims recited altering a color index table of the image, in light of the specification discloses on page 10 lines 9-10 using an appropriate hardware or software that is taught by Delorme in col. 12 lines 20-30.

Art Unit: 2628

Regarding claims 74-75, they are rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claims 31-32, above.

Regarding claim 73, it is rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claim 30, above.

Claims 36-37.

The presentation of the visual effect comprises provision of a shaking or vibrating version of the image, Dig does not explicitly specify animating the visual effect, however, Delorme at col. 32 lines 5-25 teaches customized plan with an animation. Examiner's note: animating version of an image may be considered as a distorted version of the image.

Regarding claims 79-80, they are rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claims 36-37, above.

Claim 38.

The claim recited one differently sized version of the image, and specification does not specify what the specified size of the image is, however, Delorme in fig. 8D steps 874 and 878 teaches effectively increment or decrement the POI pointer.

Regarding claim 81, it is rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claim 38, above.

Claims 39-40, 82-83.

Delorme clearly teaches the claim features in figs. 1.

Claim 41.

Claim 41 is rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claim 1 above, except the claim limitation in line 2, "a mobile station", that is taught by Delorme in figs. 1.

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Delorme's PDA 15 in fig. 1A3, also using the internet 109 in fig. 1A into DIG and

Art Unit: 2628

Morris, because, Delorme uses the navigation, and a digital camera 13 with a wireless system that would be beneficial to a user to incorporate DIG's XML (Extensible Markup Language) to obtain the claimed limitations.

Claim 45.

Claim 45 is rejected with similar reasons as set forth in claim 1 above, except the claim limitation in lines 4-6 that recited " a camera configured to capture an image .." Delorme teaches this limitation in figs. 1.

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Delorme's PDA 15 in fig. 1A3, also using the internet 109 in fig. 1A into DIG and morris, because, Delorme uses the navigation, and a digital camera 13 with a wireless system that would be beneficial to a user to incorporate DIG's XML (Extensible Markup Language) to obtain the claimed limitations.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Javid A. Amini whose telephone number is 571-272-7654. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kee Tung can be reached on 571-272-7794. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2628

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Javid A Amini
Examiner
Art Unit 2628

/Javid A Amini/
Examiner, Art Unit 2628